

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated January 5, 2006, claims 1, 3, 4, 11-13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 25, and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,154,646 (Tran); claims 5-7, 9-10, 16, 24, 26-28, 32, 33, 35, 36, and 38 were rejected under § 103 over Tran in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,909,708 (Krishnaswamy); and claims 14, 34, 37, and 39 were rejected under § 103 over Tran in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,395 (Nishi).

Claim 1 was again rejected over Tran. Although Applicant does not believe that claim 1 is anticipated by Tran (see arguments presented in the previous Reply to Office Action), Applicant has nevertheless added a further element into claim 1 to further distinguish claim 1 from Tran. The Office Action asserted that the user selection (indicated as element 35 in Fig. 2) constitutes the comparing act of claim 1. 1/5/2006 Office Action at 3. More specifically, the Office Action cited to column 4, lines 1-3, which refers to a *user* reviewing call information and selecting an option for call treatment in a browser menu. *Id.* at 6.

It is important to note that the passages cited by the Office Action refer to a user manually reviewing call information and manually selecting an option for call treatment in a browser. That is clearly not what is cited in claim 1. Claim 1 recites comparing, by a rules engine executable in a user system, information in a control message (for a call session) against one or more predetermined criteria, and loading a web page, in a user system, based on the comparison by the rules engine of the information in the control message with the one or more predetermined criteria. A user manually reviewing call information and manually selecting an option cannot possibly satisfy the act of comparing, by a rules engine executable in a user system, information in the control message against one or more predetermined criteria.

The Office Action also erroneously identified elements 19 and 21, depicted in Fig. 1 of Tran, as constituting the loading task of claim 1. Note that claim 1 recites loading a web page, *in the user system*, based on *comparison* of information in the control message with the one or more predetermined criteria. Elements 19 and 21 in Fig. 1 of Tran are elements in an HLR 18, which is not part of the mobile station 10 (considered by the Office Action as being the user system). Moreover, element 19 of Tran is an HDML server and element 20 is a service node portion. Tran, 3:54-57. There is no mention whatsoever that the HDML server 19 or the service node portion 20 of Tran loads a web page, *in the user system*, based on *comparison* of information in

the control message (which is received in the user system) with the one or more predetermined criteria (which is entered by a user through a user interface of the user system).

The Office Action's citation of column 2, lines 51-65, and column 3, line 41-column 4, line 21, of Tran does not support the contention in the Office Action that Tran teaches the loading act of claim 1. The cited column 2 passage describes a browser in a mobile station that allows an incoming call to be presented to the user on the display of the mobile station, along with call-treatment options that can be selected by the user. This refers to the manual review and manual selection of call treatment options discussed above, and described in column 4 of Tran. The cited passages in columns 3 and 4 provide more detail regarding this manual review and manual selection feature of Tran. Moreover, the cited passages in columns 3 and 4 of Tran further describe how a handler 14 in the mobile station packages the user selected call-treatment option into messages that are sent to the mobile switching center/base station (MSC/BS) 15, which are then directed to an HLR/SCP 18. Note that the MSC/BS and HLR/SCP elements depicted in Fig. 1 of Tran are part of the wireless core network, *not* part of the mobile station. Therefore, any processing by the MSC/BS or HLR/SCP of Tran cannot possibly constitute loading a web page, *in the user system*, based on the comparison of information in the control message with the one or more predetermined criteria.

Even more fundamentally, even if the MSC/BS or HLR/SCP can be considered a user system (which clearly is unreasonable), none of the MSC/BS or HLR/SCP loads a web page in a browser. As core network components, the MSC/BS and HLR/SCP would not load any web page, as loading any web page in the MSC/BS or HLR/SCP would be useless and clearly not conventionally done, as understood by persons of ordinary skill in the art.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that claim 1 is not anticipated by Tran.

Independent claim 17 is also allowable over Tran, which does not disclose a *rules processing module* executable on the processor to compare information in a call request with a set of one or more user-defined rules, and to invoke a web browser based on comparing the information in the call request with the set of one or more user-defined rules.

Tran also does not disclose the subject matter of claim 25, which recites instructions that when executed cause a user device to compare information in the control message with one or

more predetermined user-defined rules, and to load a web page in response to comparing the information on the control message with the one or more predetermined user-defined rules.

Independent claim 29 is allowable because Tran does not disclose instructions that when executed cause a user device to perform a rules check of information in a call request by invoking a rules engine to compare information in the call request with one or more user criteria, and launching a web browser based on the rules check performed by the rules engine.

Independent claim 30 is allowable over Tran because Tran does not disclose a *controller* adapted to compare information in one of an inbound and outbound message with user-entered rules, launching a first software routine in response to the controller determining that the first set of rules is satisfied, and launching a second software routine in response to the controller determining that the second set of rules is satisfied.

Independent claim 31 is allowable because Tran does not disclose a user system having a *controller* to compare information in the call request with user-entered rules and to load a web page in a web browser in response to the comparing.

Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims. In view of the allowability of base claims over Tran, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejections of dependent claims over Tran and other references have also been overcome.

Moreover, with respect to dependent claims 7 and 28 (which were rejected as being obvious over Tran and Krishnaswamy), the Office Action made an incorrect factual assertion that Krishnaswamy teaches “establishing call sessions according to session initiation protocol (SIP).” 1/5/2006 Office Action at 4. In fact, Krishnaswamy makes absolutely no mention of session initiation protocol. Although Krishnaswamy cites various requests for comments (RFCs), nowhere is there any reference to an RFC that refers to RFC 2543 (which is the specification for an earlier version of session initiation protocol). In fact, the filing date of Krishnaswamy is 1996, which is more than two years earlier than the date of the session initiation protocol specification (RFC 2543). See Information Disclosure Statement submitted by Applicant on March 19, 2001. In view of the factually incorrect statement made in the Office Action, the obviousness rejections of claims 7 and 28 are further defective.

Moreover, there simply did not exist any motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of Tran and Krishnaswamy. Krishnaswamy relates to use of H.323. However, there did not exist any suggestion in Krishnaswamy and Tran of applying the H.323 mechanisms of Krishnaswamy to the system in Tran. Note that in Tran, the MSC/BS is a traditional circuit-switched mobile switching center and base station that is capable of providing supplementary services such as SMS (short message service). There is no suggestion anywhere that it would be desirable for the MSC/BS of Tran to incorporate H.323 processing capabilities. There is also no teaching or suggestion anywhere that it would be desirable to modify the mobile stations of Tran to incorporate H.323 capabilities. Therefore, no motivation or suggestion existed to combine the teachings of Tran and Krishnaswamy to achieve the claimed subject matter.

With respect to the rejection of the claims over Tran and Nishi, it is noted that there is clearly no motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of Tran and Nishi in the manner proposed by the Office Action. Note that Tran refers to a user manually reviewing a call request and manually selecting the call treatment options – there clearly did not exist any suggestion of any desirability to incorporate user-defined rules as recited in the claims into the system of Tran. Therefore, because no motivation or suggestion existed to combine the teachings of Tran and Nishi, the obviousness rejection of the claims over Tran and Nishi is also defective.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (NRT.0052US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Apr 4, 2006


Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883